DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 465 722 SP 040 756

AUTHOR Akins, Kathleen P.; Parkinson, Karen M.; Reeder, Patti H.
TITLE The Perceptions of Third through Fifth Grade Classroom Teachers and Special Service Teachers toward Their Involvement in Collaborative Instruction.
PUB DATE 2002-04-30
NOTE 51p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Mainstreaming; Planning; Special Education Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Collaboration; Teacher Role; *Team Teaching; *Teamwork

ABSTRACT

This action research study describes the perceptions of third through fifth grade classroom teachers and special services teachers who provided services to students needing special modifications in their instruction or interventions in order to succeed in regular classrooms. Participants indicated their level of agreement with 14 questions on a 4-item Likert scale survey instrument. The survey focused on their role in and beliefs about collaborative instruction and collaborative relationships. In addition, participants responded to four open-ended questions that related directly to subproblems. Results indicated that both regular education teachers and special services teachers were generally satisfied with their current involvement with the collaborative instructional model. Nearly all respondents cited inadequate planning time as a barrier to effective collaborative instruction. However, most respondents perceived that they had satisfactory access to and support from their collaborative partners and that they had developed adequate skills for resolving any differences that might occur during instruction. Individual collaborative teams appeared to have been exposed to very different experiences. The surveys and survey information are appended. (Contains 34 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 465 722

The Perceptions of Third through Fifth Grade Classroom Teachers and Special Services Teachers toward Their Involvement in Collaborative Instruction

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kathleen P. A Akins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kathleen P. Akins

Karen M. Parkinson

Patti H. Reeder

SP040756

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this action research study was to describe the perceptions of third grade through fifth grade elementary classroom teachers and special services teachers toward their involvement in collaborative instruction. Participants indicated their level of agreement with 14 questions on a four-item Likert scale survey instrument. In addition, participants responded to four open-ended questions that related directly to the subproblems. Results of the survey and questionnaire suggest that the sample teachers are generally satisfied with their current involvement in the collaborative instructional model. Nearly all participants cite inadequate planning time as a barrier to effective collaborative instruction. The mixed responses from the remaining items indicate that individual collaborative teams have been exposed to very different experiences.

The Perceptions of Third through Fifth Grade Classroom Teachers and Special Services Teachers toward Their Involvement in Collaborative Instruction

The complex needs of the growing special services student population has challenged school systems to implement alternative service models such as collaborative instruction. Collaborative instruction is designed to combine the efforts of the classroom and special services teachers. Together they should plan, prepare, and provide instruction and evaluation of students with special needs in a regular classroom setting. This collegial interaction should create a dynamic classroom situation to promote increased learning for both students and teachers.

The collaborative program model enables many remedial and special education students to learn alongside their classmates. It also helps to eliminate the social stigma of remedial and special education labeling. The partnership of the teachers can provide an environment that fosters higher student self-esteem and success.

In collaborative models of instruction, the teachers involved must have a clear understanding of their roles, be willing participants, have a common planning time, and have ongoing training and support systems (Hines, 1994). If barriers exist which preclude successful implementation of the collaborative approach to instruction, they should be identified. The perceptions of classroom and special services teachers that are involved in collaborative instruction should be considered in order to further enhance the effectiveness of this program model.

Review of Related Literature

The ability of the general education classroom to accommodate the learning needs of mainstreamed special education students has long been questioned by concerned

educators. A study (Baker & Zigmund, 1990) followed the progress of thirteen mainstreamed, learning disabled students over one year and found that the mainstreamed students made no progress in academic skills when they were taught in the general education classroom. By way of explanation, the authors point out that the general education classroom maintained normal procedures during the mainstreaming period. That is, the regular classroom teacher varied little from large group instructional strategies. There was no individualization or differentiation of assignments, and conformity, not accommodation, for the students with different needs was emphasized. Success in such a classroom would certainly be questionable for the mainstreamed special education students as well as many at risk learners within the class.

Clearly, if the special education student is to be successfully included in the general education classroom for instruction, it must be part of a much larger school-wide improvement effort involving fundamental changes in mainstreamed instructional practices (Baker & Zigmond, 1990). Varying the size of instructional groupings based on different learning needs and integrating alternative instructional practices to accommodate different learning styles are only two of the changes which must occur in the general classroom attempting to effectively instruct diverse student groups. These changes, however, are not easily made nor maintained by the typical classroom teacher who is attempting to respond to increased expectations for student achievement and an unprecedented measure of school based accountability.

School system improvement efforts to broaden the repertoire of instructional strategies within the general classroom to accommodate a more diverse group of learners are not likely to be achieved by simple administrative order or by consultation from

special education colleagues alone. Rather, a more directly supportive and assistive strategy must be employed to enable the general classroom teacher to respond successfully to this challenge. A special education service delivery model, which appears to respond to this need, is that of collaborative teaching.

Collaborative instruction, according to Reeves (1991) and Bauwens, Hourcade, and Friend (1989) is described as an educational approach in which general and special educators work as a team in a coordinated way to jointly teach groups of students that are heterogeneously grouped academically and behaviorally. The collaborative teaching model was initially developed and most widely implemented in a variety of schools in the Pacific Northwest (Bauwens et al., 1989). Ripley (1997) noted that both the teachers must be simultaneously present in the classroom and must maintain joint responsibility for the instruction.

Instruction from the collaborative model is based on six basic principles (Reeves, 1991). The initial principle is that every teacher, regular or special, has a set of skills, competencies, and an information base that can benefit the learners. Secondly, no single teacher knows everything, but when paired with another teacher, every teacher's effectiveness expands exponentially. The third principle states that teachers have shared values, one of which is the belief that every student has the right to the best education available. According to the fourth principle, no single individual alone can effect the greatest good in the life of the student; therefore, teachers must form partnerships. The fifth principle is that instructional teams are comprised of equal partners. The final principle asserts that mutual sharing and cooperation form the bedrock of collaboration.

As an extension of the consultation model, collaborative teaching provides direct

assistance to the general educator in adapting and modifying instruction for the mainstreamed special education student. The advantages of collaboration, particularly in enabling the general education classroom to provide individualized instruction through the use of differentiated instructional groupings and strategies, are perhaps obvious by having two teachers in the classroom. More importantly, however, research has demonstrated that pull-in collaborative programs serve as strong vehicles for staff development in fostering increased tolerance and understanding of student learning problems (Johnson & Pugach, 1991). They also increase teacher instructional skills with differing student groups (Meyers, Gelzehlesser, & Yelich, 1991). The general educator brings content specialization and knowledge of the curriculum to the classroom, while the special education teacher brings experience in assessment and adaption specializations. Both bring training in teaching techniques and learning processes (Ripley, 1997).

The first step to successfully mainstream students (Gulledge & Slobe, 1990) is to destroy any existing barriers between the two groups of educators. Lumpkin and Parker (1988) state that all the elements of a school program were inter-related and any changes made should reflect the total curriculum. The needs of handicapped students were met by changing and improving instruction for all students who would have the opportunity to learn with their age peer group. Students are no longer singled out but, instead, instructional support is provided to all students in the classroom setting (Johnston, Tulbert, Sebastian, Devries, & Gompert, 2000).

Tinzmann (1990) listed some general characteristics of the collaborative classroom. The first two characteristics described relationships between students and teachers. The third characterized new approaches to collaborative instruction. The fourth

described the composition or makeup of a collaborative classroom. Bauwens et al. (1989) explained other elements of classroom instruction involving more than one teacher. With collaborative teaching, the instruction is provided through a cooperative agreement between the general and special educators. Both teachers plan and teach academic subject content to all students. In these supportive learning activities, both educators develop and deliver instructional content and curriculum development and modifications together in the general education classroom (Bauwens et al; Walther-Thomas, 1997; Johnston et al, 2000).

Cohen (1976) noted that teachers defined themselves as team partners if four criteria are met. Team partners should plan instruction and evaluate students together. Discipline should be coordinated and the subject material jointly taught. Cole (1992) also noted the importance of addressing key issues between the teachers, such as grading and curriculum accommodations and modifications that are needed in instruction. Maintaining a working partnership while meeting the diverse needs of students is also important while using collaborative teaching options (Glomb, 1999). Ripley (1997) noted that if joint planning of instruction is not occurring, it is not collaboration, but rather one teacher with an assistant. Additional responsibilities of collaborative instruction include establishing the physical design of the room, determining any unique features that the class may have or need, selecting a modified and flexible curriculum, establishing the rules for the students in a collaborative setting, planning lessons, and examining learning styles (Harris, 1990).

Hansen (1989) pointed out that collaborative teaching is not the answer to every teaching problem. It is not a remedy that will answer all our questions or solve all our

dilemmas. Some students will still need the specialized services available in pullout or self-contained classes. It can not make up for any shortage of trained special educators. The idea that many more students can be reached through this model is a faulty assumption. It is not a program that can be implemented without a great deal of advanced planning and preparation. It is not a time saver. The need for planning time between special education teachers and regular education teachers is emphasized (Harris, 1990; Reeves, 1991; Viadero, 1991; Gerber, 1996; Sapon-Shevin, 1991; Estes et al., 1989; Lumpkin & Parker, 1988; Fuchs & Moore, 1988; Cohen, 1976). Planning times in elementary schools are often too short to allow for any in-depth planning to occur (Walther-Thomas, 1997).

Other barriers to collaborative teaching include the fear of the new and unknown, the need for specialized training for the general educator, overcoming the Expert Syndrome, territoriality, unrealistic expectations of success, fatigue and discouragement, and a potential decrease in direct, special services to students that need them (Reeves, 1991). Johnston et al. (2000) also identified four possible barriers to success: differences in defining roles, problems finding time and resources to make the partnership work, the fear of trying something new, and the lack of preparation on collaboration as a teaching technique. One way to overcome these barriers is to be sure that the roles of each participant is clearly defined (Harris, 1990). Some teachers consider grades being determined by the special education teacher for the slower students as a program weakness (Messersmith & Planek, 1988). Teachers in both areas share the perception that general education teachers are not skilled in teaching special education students (Daane, Beirne-Smith, & Latham, 2000). Both groups agree that, while collaboration is evident in

planning Individual Education Plans (IEP's) and teaching, the two groups do not feel comfortable with each other. More training of general education teachers is generally necessary to allow them to comfortably handle children with disabilities (Daane et al., 2000).

There are some techniques that guarantee failure of an education partnership. Some examples are teachers displaying a know-it-all attitude, being inflexible, sulking if their advice is not taken, avoiding feedback or constructive criticism, being late and inconsiderate, talking negatively about their partner, criticizing the collaborative system, being formal and superior, being pushy, and acting as if they have all the answers (Fisher, 1989). Large teams tend to break up into smaller teams and old teams disappear only to have new teams appear (Cohen, 1976). Conflict of personalities and limited time in the classroom by the special education teachers also may contribute to an unsuccessful teaming (Daane, et al.). Walther-Thomas (1997) also noted there may be conflicts with student scheduling and caseload concerns.

Collaborative teaching can create a unified educational system to serve all students and may weaken barriers between the special education and regular education programs (Viadero, 1991; Cousins & Others, 1992). A greater acceptance of the technique is evident by the increased number of textbooks and professional articles that describe procedures for creating and maintaining a successful collaboration. The existing literature reflects an improving view towards shared responsibility on the part of both teachers involved in the partnership (Welch, et al., 1999).

Gulledge (1990) suggests that collaborative teaching provides on-the-job training for regular education teachers in special education skills. He also asserts that

collaborative teaching has kept teaching from being an isolated profession. Walther-Thomas (1997) points out that the experience of working closely with another professional allows teachers to explore new ideas and to expand their professional skills.

Cobb, Elliot, and Voltz (1994) analyzed and compared the perceptions of elementary learning disabilities resource teachers and elementary general education teachers as to their actual and ideal performance of collaborative roles. Basically, it was established that collaboration among general and special educators is viewed as imperative to the success of learners with disabilities being served in general education classrooms. However, research findings have indicated that this is a significant area of deficit in actual practice. The responses from teachers suggest modest levels of performance in terms of both special and general education teacher collaborative roles. The pattern of responses on the ideal scale, however, indicates that the teachers participating in this study believed that the majority of the collaborative roles included in the instrument should be performed often or always. A lack of time was cited by both general and special education teachers as a major barrier to the performance of ideal collaborative roles. Time provisions of some kind need to be made in order to facilitate the ideal performance of collaborative roles.

Coben and Thomas (1997) stress the importance of communication to coordinate services for the students. They point out that the success of inclusion rests on this ability to communicate. Often, special needs teachers have existed as separate entities and have developed their own language which can make this communication difficult (Coben & Thomas, 1997). Hagopian et al. (1996) noted the significance of intensive involvement in the model and the value of training the staff in the proper ways to implement the

program. If teachers have input into the selection of team partners, the possibility of success is enhanced (Matranga, 1992). When teachers set up the framework of staff development for inclusion, they can make the training process relevant and useful for them. In this way, staff development is more likely to be applicable to their teaching needs as well as the learning needs of their students (Bradley & West, 1994).

In order for inclusion to work, there must also be support for the program by school administration (Bailey et al., 1993). The administration must be responsive to the teachers as they attempt new strategies and must provide a risk-free, flexible environment. They must realize that all students can learn and teach each other. Teachers must be encouraged to coach each other and create support systems. On-going training should be a priority and frequently offered to all teachers. The administration should also set expectations for experimentation and change and become personally involved in the program (Estes et al., 1989). Additionally, principals should be willing to share the decision-making with the teachers (Cohen, 1976). Collaborative instruction is not likely to be successfully implemented in the school without administrative support and a systematic approach (Estes et al.).

An overview of the issues surrounding the Regular Education Initiative (REI), showed that it was apparent that the proposed policy changes have potentially far-reaching effects for both regular and special education teachers and their students. However, beyond the rhetoric of policymakers, little attention has been focused on the views of educators. Kauffman et al. (1988) specifically expressed concern for the lack of input from regular teachers:

> Strangely absent from the models of teaching that are implicitly assumed by most REI proponents is a realistic model of the cognitive operations of persons who actually teach. Our concern, therefore, is that enough respect be shown for regular classroom teachers, to ask them what they perceive, based on teaching practice, is feasible, desirable, and in the best interest of students (p. 9).

Thus, the purpose of this study is to describe the perceptions of third grade through fifth grade elementary classroom teachers and special services teachers toward their involvement in collaborative instruction.

Method

Sample

The participants in this action research study were 12 third grade through fifth grade classroom teachers and 6 special services teachers who have taught in the collaborative instructional model in a public elementary school, yielding a total sample size of 18 teachers. The classroom teachers are the general or regular education teachers in whose classrooms services are delivered by the team. Participants included 4 third grade teachers, 5 fourth grade teachers, and 3 fifth grade teachers. Special services teachers are teachers who provide a full range of services to students who need special modifications in their instruction or interventions in order to succeed in the regular education classroom. Special services include the Early Intervention Program for remedial education and Special Education. Two Special Education and 4 Early Intervention Program teachers were included in this sample. First year teachers were excluded from this study since they would not be able to compare and contrast previous collaborative instructional experiences with their current experience. Seventeen female

teachers and one male teacher were included in the sample. Teaching experience among the participants ranged from 7 to 27 years, with a mean of 18 years, and a mode of 20 years of experience. The participants' years of collaborative instructional experience ranged from 2 to 10 years, with a mean of 7 years, and a mode of 10 years of experience. Of these teacher participants, 3 have attained a Bachelor's Degree, 12 have attained a Master's Degree, and 3 have attained an Education Specialist's Degree.

Description of the Elementary School

The elementary school, which was established in 1990 as part of a multi-school complex comprised of an elementary, middle, and high school, is located in Georgia. This school houses a diverse and unique population, which includes families that vary greatly both in socioeconomic and educational backgrounds. The school serves students in grades pre-kindergarten through fifth grade with a total enrollment of 656. According to the 1999-2000 Georgia Public Education Report Card, the representation of racial-ethnic groups is 78.8% White, 14.5% African American, 3.4% Hispanic, 1.4% Asian, .61% American Indian, and 1.4% multi-racial. The male/female ratio is 51.4% male and 48.6% female. Currently, 19.1% of the students are eligible to participate in the free and reduced breakfast/lunch program, compared to a school system average of 6.7%. Approximately 23% of the school's students qualify for remedial education services. The English Speakers of Other Language (ESOL) program presently serves 13 students. The percentage of the students receiving special education services is 15.6. The percentage of gifted students is 9.5.

The students in the third through fifth grades who are being served in the special education collaborative instructional model include 6 White, male students in third grade;

a total of 5 students in fourth grade consisting of 1 White male, 1 African American male, and 3 White females; and a total of 19 fifth grade students with 10 White males, 4 African American males, 3 White females, 1 African American female, and 1 Hispanic male.

Students being served in the remedial education collaborative model include 18 third grade students who qualify for reading and 11 third grade students who qualify for math. Of these 11 third grade remedial math students, 6 are female and 5 are male. Two students are African American, 3 students are Hispanic, and 6 students are White. The 18 remedial reading students are composed of 8 female and 10 male students. Four of these third graders are African American, 4 are Hispanic, 9 are White and 1 is Asian.

Twenty fourth grade students qualify for remedial math services, while 23 students qualify for remedial reading services. Eleven of the math students are female and 13 are male. Eight students are African American, 4 are Hispanic, and 8 are White. Of the 23 reading students, 13 are male and 10 are female; 8 are African American, 2 are Hispanic, and 13 are White.

Fourteen fifth grade students qualify for remedial math services. Of these 14 students, 6 are female and 8 are male. Four students are African American, 1 is Hispanic, and 9 are White. In addition, 22 fifth graders qualify for remedial reading services, with 14 being male and 8 being female. These 22 students are comprised of 7 African American, 2 Hispanic, and 13 White students.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was designed by the researchers to collect quantitative data about the participants' perceptions toward their involvement in collaborative instruction.

Participants completed this self-administered survey indicating their level of agreement with 14 questions in the format of a four-item Likert scale. In addition, participants responded to four open-ended questions that correspond with the Likert questions. Six demographic questions were also included to gather information in reference to the participants. The coefficient alpha for the survey instrument was .76, which shows that it was a reliable instrument.

Data Analysis

SPSS Statistical Software was used to analyze the collected data for each item on the survey instrument. A crosstabulation was performed on each survey instrument item to show response differences between classroom teachers and special services teachers. A t-test was run to further identify group statistics between classroom and special services teachers. Classroom teachers had a mean on the Likert scale of 35.67, with a standard deviation of 3.58, and a standard error mean of 1.03. Special services teachers had a mean of 44.33 on the Likert scale with a standard deviation of 3.2042, and a standard error mean of 1.31. This indicates that special services teachers generally had a more positive attitude toward their experiences with collaborative instruction than did regular classroom teachers. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances showed F = .003 and Sig. = .055. The t-test for Equality of Means resulted in t = -5.004, df = 16, Sig. (2-tailed) = .000, Mean Difference = -8.67, Standard Error Difference = 1.73, and the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference was Lower = -12.34 with Upper = -4.99 for the equal variances assumed. For equal variances not assumed, t = -5.20, df = 11.19, Sig. (2-tailed) = .000, Mean Difference = -8.67, Standard Error Difference = 1.67, 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference was Lower = -12.33 with Upper = -5.01.

Results

Collaborative Instruction Survey

The Collaborative Instruction Survey instrument results for the sample teachers' responses to their current or most recent collaborative instructional relationship follow. The first item presented was, "my roles and responsibilities as a collaborative team member are clearly defined." Teachers' responses resulted in 16.7% strongly disagree, 33.3% disagree, 38.9% agree, and 11.1% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 4 disagree, 6 agree, and 2 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 3 strongly disagree, 2 disagree, and 1 agrees. This indicates that 50% of the teachers perceive that they understand their roles and responsibilities as a collaborative team member, while 50% are uncertain as to their roles and responsibilities. However, only one special services teacher agrees with the statement.

The second item presented was, "I have adequate planning time with my collaborative team partner." Teachers' responses resulted in 38.9% strongly disagree, 50.0% disagree, and 11.1% agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 6 strongly disagree, 5 disagree, and 1 agrees. Special services teachers' responses were 1 strongly disagrees, 4 disagree, and 1 agrees. Agreement with this item indicates that the respondents believe adequate planning time for collaborative instruction is not available.

The third item presented was, "I have satisfactory access and support from my collaborative instructional partner." Teachers' responses resulted in 5.6% strongly disagree, 77.8% agree, and 16.7% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 1 strongly disagrees and 11 agree. Special services teachers' responses were 3 agree and 3

strongly agree. Agreement with this item indicates that the collaborative teachers in this sample are supportive and accessible to each other.

The fourth item presented was, "collaborative instruction is disruptive to the regular classroom routines." Teachers' responses resulted in 5.6% strongly disagree, 11.1% disagree, 61.1% agree, and 22.2% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 disagree, 8 agree, and 2 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 1 strongly disagree, 3 agree, and 2 strongly agree. The high percentage of teachers agreeing with this item indicates that collaborative instruction can be disruptive to the regular classroom routines.

The fifth item presented was, "an open line of communication exists between my collaborative team member and myself." Teachers' responses resulted in 50.0% agree and 50.0% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 7 agree and 5 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 2 agree and 4 strongly agree. The overwhelming agreement with this item suggests that the collaborative instructional members communicate well.

The sixth item presented was, "both instructors in my collaborative team are equally accountable for the success of the students." Teachers' responses resulted in 11.1% strongly disagree, 38.9% disagree, 38.9% agree, and 11.1% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 strongly disagree, 5 disagree, and 5 agree. Special services teachers' responses were 2 disagree, 2 agree, and 2 strongly agree. The results of this item seem to indicate that some collaborative partnerships more equally share responsibility for student success than others do.

The seventh item presented was, "my collaborative team partner is often absent." Teachers' responses resulted in 11.1% strongly disagree, 33.3% disagree, 33.3% agree, and 22.2% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 strongly disagree, 6 disagree, 4 agree, and 4 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 2 agree and 4 strongly agree. This response indicates that absenteeism occurs in some collaborative partnerships more often than in others.

The eighth item presented was, "my collaborative team partner is often tardy." Teachers' responses resulted in 22.2% strongly disagree, 27.8% disagree, 27.8% agree, and 22.2% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 4 strongly disagree, 5 disagree, 3 agree, and 4 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 2 agree and 4 strongly agree. This response indicates that tardiness is a factor in one half of the collaborative partnerships.

The ninth item presented was, "classroom responsibilities are equitable between my collaborative team partner and myself." Teachers' responses resulted in 11.1% strongly disagree, 55.6% disagree, 27.8% agree, and 5.6% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 strongly disagree, 9 disagree, and 1 agrees. Special services teachers' responses were 1 disagrees, 4 agree, and 1 strongly agrees. The high number of classroom teachers disagreeing with this item indicates that they perceive an inequity in classroom responsibilities, while the special services teachers seem to perceive them as being equitable.

The tenth item presented was, "I have received adequate training in collaborative instructional techniques, roles, and responsibilities." Teachers' responses resulted in 44.4% disagree, 38.9% agree, and 16.7% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses

were 7 disagree, 3 agree, and 2 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 1 disagrees, 4 agree, and 1 strongly agrees. These responses indicate that most of the special services teachers perceive themselves as having adequate training for collaborative instruction, while some of the classroom teachers perceive their training to be inadequate.

The eleventh item presented was, "administration is supportive of the collaborative instructional model." Teachers' responses resulted in 11.1% disagree, 38.9% agree, and 50.0% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 disagree, 5 agree, and 5 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 2 agree and 4 strongly agree. The high agreement on this item indicates that collaborative teachers perceive that administration is supportive of the collaborative instructional model.

The twelfth item presented was, "administration develops effective scheduling for implementing collaborative instruction." Teachers' responses resulted in 5.6 strongly disagree, 33.3% disagree, 44.4% agree, and 16.7% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 1 strongly disagrees, 6 disagree, 5 agree, and 3 strongly agree. Special services teachers' responses were 3 agree and 3 strongly agree. The results of this item indicate that special services teachers perceive the scheduling for collaborative instruction to be effective. However, nearly one-half of the classroom teachers perceive the scheduling to be ineffective.

The thirteenth item presented was, "administration is considerate of the needs of the students and teachers when placing students for collaborative instruction." Teachers' responses resulted in 27.8% disagree, 44.4% agree, and 27.8% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 5 disagree, 6 agree, and 1 strongly agrees. Special services

teachers' responses were 2 agree and 4 strongly agree. The response to this item indicates that special services teachers perceive placement of students for collaborative instruction to be effective in relation to the needs of the students and teachers. However, 5 classroom teachers disagree with student placement effectiveness.

The fourteenth item presented was, "my collaborative team partner and I have developed adequate skills for resolving differences in philosophy regarding students, behavior management, acceptable instructional modifications, etc." Teachers' responses resulted in 11.1% disagree, 72.2% agree, and 16.7% strongly agree. Classroom teachers' responses were 2 disagree, 9 agree, and 1 strongly agrees. Special services teachers' responses were 4 agree and 2 strongly agree. The responses to this item indicate that the large majority of collaborative teachers have developed skills for positive collaborative instruction.

Collaborative Instruction Questionnaire

The first open-ended question was, "In your opinion, what are three characteristics of an ideal collaborative partnership?" In describing the ideal situation, every teacher mentioned the willingness and ability to work with another teacher. Twelve teachers (67%) cited flexibility and a willingness to collaborate as essential to a successful instructional partnership. Some comments were "being able to work as a team with no ego problems", "classroom teachers being able to share their territory", and "a willingness to be a true partner or team and being willing to try others' ideas".

Another idea revealed was the need for teachers to complement one another. Nine teachers (50%) mentioned "a compatibility of ideas", "a common philosophy", "personalities and expectations that match closely", "personalities that mesh", "teaching

styles and classroom management styles that are compatible and complementary", and "a sharing of similar philosophies of education".

Eleven respondents (61%) mentioned the need for adequate planning time to develop good, collaborative lessons. Of the 11 teachers, eight (75%) were classroom teachers and three (50%) were special services teachers. Three teachers also noted that this planning time needed to be in addition to regular planning time, not a reallocation of the current time available. One regular education classroom teacher noted that "planning time would enhance instruction and modifications for instruction".

Other elements suggested for ideal collaborative partnerships were "a large block of flexible time for collaborative instruction", "flexibility in using the time, including occasional pull-out times", "open communication between the partners", "clearly defined roles and responsibilities for grading and modifications", "respect for each other's expertise", "dependability and administrative support so that collaborative teachers are provided with substitutes when they are absent or in meetings", and "equal responsibility for grading, instruction, and parent conferencing". The concept most stressed was flexibility on the parts of both collaborative teachers.

The second question was, "In your opinion, what are three barriers to effective collaborative partnerships?" Eighty-three percent of the respondents who are classroom teachers agree or strongly agree that collaboration is disruptive to the regular classroom routines. The major criticism of 50% of the regular education teachers is that "the lack of planning time makes it difficult to maximize instructional time and needs" and that often "the collaborative teacher comes in and doesn't know what is going on". This lack of communication has the collaborative teacher sometimes walking in and saying, "What

are we doing today?" Of the special education and IEP teachers surveyed, 33% agreed that the lack of planning time is a difficulty.

The second main criticism is that the special education and EIP teachers are not on time or are out frequently, although sometimes they "just don't show up". This is sometimes due to other responsibilities that keep them away such as committee work, special education meetings, Student Support Team (SST) meetings, or testing. The classroom teachers also noted that the schedules for their classrooms are dictated by collaboration. They do not like to have to plan their days around the times that the collaborative teachers are scheduled to come into their classrooms. Also brought up was the reluctance on the parts of some collaborative teachers to pullout students for small group instruction, even on an occasional basis.

Eighty-three percent of the respondents that were special education or EIP teachers also agree that collaboration is disruptive to the regular classroom routines. The collaborative teachers coming into the classrooms made few comments here. Obviously this is because they are the ones going into another teacher's classroom.

Sixty-seven percent of the special education and EIP teachers surveyed revealed that attitude or personality could be problematic. This can be as simple as a "lack of rapport" to "having a very formal teacher-directed classroom that is not conducive to the give and take of spontaneous teaching". Actually, they believe that "controlling personalities on either side" can be a barrier. Also pointed out as an obstruction in collaboration, is "rigidness in personality" and "unappreciative attitudes toward the collaborative teacher".

Of the classroom teachers surveyed, 50% feel that the responsibilities in a collaborative classroom are not equitably shared. They see their collaborative partners at times as not wanting to be responsible for instruction. "They just want to assist." Regular education teachers feel that collaborative teachers sometimes take a subordinate "helper type" role. They would like to see more "shared responsibilities" to include help with planning, grading papers, and parent contacts. On the other hand, one collaborative teacher feels that it can be a problem when the classroom teacher "has difficulty giving up control of her classroom or students in order to participate in collaboration". One of the classroom teachers wrote, "Adequate training is crucial if both partners are to fulfill their roles". New teachers coming into this situation have not had the rigorous training that was involved at the conception of this program. They are "just thrown into it". Just 33% of the collaborative teachers feel that "undefined roles" is a problem in the classroom.

Only 44% of the classroom teachers feel that administration develops effective scheduling for implementing collaborative instruction. They listed that students are not "grouped properly for the type of collaboration that has been set up" or that there are "too many special needs children in one class to have an effective mix". It was also noted that at times there are "not enough collaborative homerooms". This makes the "correct placement of students" difficult and it overloads some homerooms. The special education and EIP teachers have a different view of this situation. One hundred percent of those surveyed feel that the scheduling process works. They believe that administration does indeed develop effective scheduling for implementing collaborative instruction.

The special services collaborative teachers had other concerns as well. They sometimes notice in the regular education teacher an "unwillingness to make changes for the success of students and moreover a disinterest in trying anything different". Also perceived is that occasionally the regular education teacher "resents having special needs students and is unwilling to modify the work". One of these teachers stated that it is a difficulty when "the classroom teacher frequently changes the schedule without prior notification". Another impediment to successful collaboration is "different beliefs and ideas on children and how the should be dealt with".

The third question was, "Think back to collaborative relationships that have 'worked' for you. What specific things did the collaborators do that made it work?" The most important characteristic noted was the way in which the teachers felt about each other and their students. Every teacher mentioned the importance of this. The first area mentioned by 67% of the regular education classroom teachers and 60% of the special services teachers was that the teachers successfully collaborated on instruction and, as a result, enhanced each other's teaching. Examples of comments made are "we shared our knowledge", "she really knew her stuff", the "teachers had an innate sense of how to adjust the curriculum to meet varied needs without watering down the content", and the collaborative teacher "brought new and innovative ways to teach the curriculum".

All surveyed teachers mentioned the importance of the relationship between the two teachers. Positive comments supporting the aforementioned are, "She made me feel like I was doing a good job", the collaborative partner "always supported my opinions", "showed respect for their partner around other adults and the children", "had a sense of humor", "willing to talk openly to one another and negotiate any differences without hurt

feelings", "true team player", "strong work ethic", "positive classroom environment", and the idea that both teachers are equally responsible for the instruction in the classroom.

All teachers surveyed referred to the significance of dealing with students. Seventy-five percent of the regular education classroom teachers and 100% of the special services teachers noted the importance of dealing effectively with each individual child. Typical comments were "both partners put the needs of the students first", "a genuine concern for the remedial students' success", "worked to teach the whole class, not focus just on 'their students' success", "both partners tried to put the needs of the students first", and "the teacher was one who loved and owned all the students in the class." Three teachers also brought up the necessity of having time to meet and discuss the abilities and needs of each student.

Forty-four percent of the teachers, 50% of the regular education classroom teachers and 33% of the special services teachers, cited the need for having regular planning time together. It was noted, however, that this needs to be in addition to the time already allocated for normal planning time. Three regular education classroom teachers (25%) noted the magnitude of collaborative teachers being able to "step into the instructional flow", "have verbal interplay back and forth between the two teachers and the students", "enter the room everyday and join in where we are". Without planning time, it was important for teachers to have the needed flexibility to adjust to the instruction. Twenty-two percent of the classroom teachers and 11% of the special education teachers mentioned flexibility in the roles of their collaborative partners. A flexibility and "openness to changing the routine when necessary" was cited. One teacher

noted that it was also important for the students to learn to be flexible and have the ability to "shift focus between two leaders".

Dependability and punctuality were mentioned as important factors in a successful collaborative partnership. Four classroom teachers (22%) noted that it is important for the collaborative teachers to be dependable and arrive on time. Respondents also stated that reliability and a clear definition of roles are two items that add to a workable collaborative team.

The fourth section of questions consisted of, "Recall ineffective collaborative experiences. In your opinion, what are three conditions that made the experience(s) ineffective? Why didn't they work?" Of the classroom teachers that took the survey, 75% agree or strongly agree that the special services collaborative teachers currently serving in their classrooms are often absent or tardy. Teachers remarked that poor attendance means that they "cannot rely on them being there any day of the week" and that "other school commitments come first before classroom teaching time". They find this "lack of initiative or effort on the special services teachers' parts" to be disturbing. One teacher noted that the special services teacher "rarely came" while another says that besides being "frequently late or absent" she was often "not prepared". One special services teacher also recognized this as a problem.

Forty-two percent of the classroom teachers taking the survey felt that at times the special services teachers "act more like a visitor rather than a partner who needs to be teaching along with me" or that "they have no clue what to do and that not enough time is spent with the children who really need it". The regular education teachers find it to be a difficult situation when the special services teachers "assume that they (the classroom

teacher) will do all the work", "show no interest in the lessons or the students", and "never contribute".

Of the special services teachers that took the survey, 33% felt that they are not fully included as a part of the class. They speak of not always having a partner who is a "team player". "The special services teacher is in the room but teaching from the classroom teacher goes on as usual." One respondent stated that it is problematic when "one or both partners are not taking full responsibility for the students and seeing them as 'my' students rather than 'our' students".

This survey further revealed that 33% of the classroom and special services teachers agree that insufficient planning time is a significant factor in the lack of success in many collaborative teams. The regular education teachers make comments such as, "The collaborative teachers just showed up and never discuss lessons ahead of time," or "We have very little time as it is. It is unrealistic to think that additional time for collaborative planning would be given".

It was also discovered that 33% of the classroom teachers believe that "different teaching strategies", "different teaching philosophies", and "different ideas about classroom management" contribute to a challenging situation. The special services teachers did not comment on this particular component. Twenty-five percent of the classroom teachers consider "personality conflicts" to be a hindrance to collaborative instruction. Along with this, they mentioned "a lack of trust" and "a lack of communication". One special services teacher said, "It is quite ineffective when there isn't a joyous camaraderie between the two teachers. Students can be very aware of this."

Also causal to an ineffective collaborative instructional partnership are ego problems. The survey revealed that 25% of the classroom teachers feel that there is "an attitude that collaborative (special services) teachers are better than classroom teachers". This feeling of superiority made one classroom teacher feel "not as smart" and as if she was being "treated like a child being scolded".

The major concern noted by 100% of the surveyed teachers is the lack of flexibility that can be encountered with the collaborative instructional model. They find that it can be difficult for some classroom teachers to adapt to a new situation such as collaborating. At times, the regular education teacher does not want to be adaptable and "try new ideas". One special services teacher stated, "I was working in a classroom where I never felt the students' individual needs were met." Two of these teachers mentioned circumstances in which the "atmosphere of the classroom was extremely cold and rigid" and that "all students were expected to learn through the same methods at the same rate". They also feel that "having a very formal teacher-directed classroom is not conducive to the give and take of spontaneous teaching dialogue". Also encountered was "a refusal to accept that each child needs different types of instructional input". One teacher disclosed that it is problematic "trying to serve students in the collaborative setting only, without having the provision for resource assistance where it is truly needed". There is not a continuum of services in such a situation. One regular education teacher criticized the fact that "new, different, and exciting ways to enhance lessons were not shared by the collaborative teacher".

Collaborative teams of teachers want a clear definition of roles. The classroom teachers do not want collaboration forced upon them. Some have had no training on how

to implement this instructional model. There was a major emphasis on training at the inception of this program, but there are many new teachers who have gotten no such training. One teacher stated, "A new teacher, even if she's experienced, finds it difficult to be put into a collaborative setting. Everything and everyone is new to you." A special services teacher protested that she was "expected to teach all lessons to all students while the regular classroom teacher took a 'break'."

Other concerns worthy of noting from the classroom teachers' points of view include "having students placed in the collaborative classroom whose needs are so severe that they cannot be met in the regular classroom, or they are a major distraction to others", "having students placed in the collaborative classroom when they are not actually LD (learning disabled), but are possibly just slow learners", "having children sometimes given so much help that they become dependent on the special services teacher", "having children not being taught various learning strategies", and having a collaborative partner who "takes no responsibility for grades or parent contacts". It also complicates the situation when the "special services teacher doesn't have a strong background in the subject area being taught".

Additional concerns from the special services teachers' standpoints include "having an overloaded class of students with special education and EIP needs". This makes the class "too homogeneous". They also felt that sometimes the classroom teacher "looks upon the special services teacher as only teaching the students she's assigned to". There are also the concerns that the classroom teacher "does not have an understanding of how remedial students retain knowledge" and that "the schedule is frequently changed without prior notification".

Discussion

The results of this study begin to identify the perceptions of regular education classroom teachers and special services teachers concerning their involvement in collaborative instruction. The data clearly indicate that both regular education classroom teachers and special services teachers are not generally dissatisfied with the current collaborative instructional model. Even though the sample teachers in this study sighted several barriers to ideal collaborative instruction, the majority of these teachers perceive that they have satisfactory access and support from their collaborative partners and that they have developed adequate skills for resolving any differences that may occur during instruction. Eighty-nine percent of the surveyed teachers believe that planning time with their collaborative partner is inadequate. There were mixed responses in reference to the other items addressed on the survey and questionnaire. This seems to indicate that individual collaborative teams have been exposed to very different experiences.

The survey and questionnaire responses support the need for further study of the status and needed modifications of teachers involved in collaborative instruction. It is our goal that this descriptive report will stimulate regular classroom teachers, special services teachers, and administrators to reform and refine current practices in order to overcome the barriers to effective collaborative instruction as they share responsibility for the education of children with disabilities.

References

Bailey, C. R., Arllen, N.L., & Gable, R.A. (1993). *An investigation of resistance to teacher collaboration – knowledge with which to "fix what's broken"*. (Technical Report No. 143). Portsmouth, VA: Old Dominion University.

Baker, J.M., & Zigmond, N. (1990). Are regular education classes equipped to accommodate students with learning disabilities? *Exceptional Children, 56*, 515-526.

Bauwens, J., Hourcade, J.J., & Friend, M. (1989). Cooperative teaching: A model for general and special education integration. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*, 17-22.

Bradley, D., & West, J. (1994). Staff training for the inclusion of students with disabilities: Visions from school-based educators. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 17*, 117-128.

Cobb, H.B., Elliott, N.E., Jr., & Voltz, D.L. (1994). Collaborative teacher roles: Special and general educators. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27*, 527-535.

Coben, S.S. & Thomas, C.C. (1997). Meeting the challenge of consultation and collaboration: Developing interactive teams. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 30*, 427-432.

Cohen, E. G. (1976). Problems and prospects of teaming research and development. Memorandum No. 143. (Report No. SCRDT-RDM-143). Asilomar, CA: Annual Meeting of the Sociology of Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126081).

Cole, C.M. (1992). Collaboration: Research and practice. CASE information dissemination packet (Abstract). Bloomington, IN: Department of Special Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 358653).

Daane, C.J., Beirne-Smith, M., & Latham, D. (2000). Administrators' and teachers' perceptions of the collaborative efforts of inclusion in the elementary grades. [Electronic version]. *Education, 121*, 331-338.

Estes, T., Harrison, E., & Shirley, B. (1989). Reading to learn: A model for collaboration. *NASSP, 73*, 85-91.

Fisher, S. (1989). Education partnerships: How to fail. *The Special Educator, 9*, 17-21.

Fuchs, B., & Moore, L. (1988). Collaboration for understanding and effectiveness. *The Clearing House, 61*, 410-413.

Gerber, P.J. (1996). The efficacy of the collaborative teaching model for academically-able special education students: A research report. Richmond, VA: Metropolitan Educational Research Consortium. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 411657).

Glomb, N. (1999). Collaborative elementary teaching/collaborative secondary teaching/ collaborative teaching casebooks. [Electronic version]. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 5*, 395-397.

Gulledge, J., & Slobe, P. (1990). Collaboration: A key to successful mainstreaming. *Middle School Journal, 12*, 34-36.

Hagopian, G. & Others. (1996). The 2-5 collaborative in-class model: A restructuring of the Title I program [Abstract]. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction

Service No. ED399326).

Hansen, A. (1989). Davis School District, Utah.

Harris, K. (1990). Collaborative instruction in schools: Key principles. Anaheim, CA: Conference of the Learning Disabilities Association of America. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED326001).

Hines, R.A. (1994). The best of both worlds? Collaborative teaching for effective inclusion. [Electronic version]. *Schools in the Middle*, *3*(4), 3-6.

Johnson, L.J, & Pugach, M.C. (1991). Peer collaboration: Accommodating students with mild learning and behavior problems. *Exceptional Children, 57*, 454-461.

Johnston, S.S., Tulbert, B.L., Sebastian, J.P., Devries, K. & Gompert, A. (2000). Vocabulary development: A collaborative effort for teaching content vocabulary. [Electronic version]. *Intervention in School & Clinic, 35*, 311-315.

Kauffman, J., Gerber, M., & Semmel, M. (1988). Arguable assumptions underlying the regular education initiative. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21*, 6-11.

Lumpkin, B., & Parker, F. (1988). Planning and administering a collaborative teaching program. *Reading Improvement, 25*, 179-184.

Matranga, M. (1992). Team teachers: The importance of the selection process. [Electronic version]. *Journal of School Leadership*, *2*, 225-231.

Messersmith, J., & Plantek, G. (1986, October). Changing the "I" to "we": Effective mainstreaming through cooperative teaching. *NASSP,* 66-68.

Meyers, J., Gelzheizer, L., & Yelich (1991). Do pull in programs foster teacher collaboration? *Remedial and Special Education, 12,* 7-15.

Reeves, R. (1991). Collaborative instruction: Making it work for everyone. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Ripley, S. (1997). Collaboration between general and special education teachers. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED409317).

Sapon-Shevin, A. (1991). Cooperative learning in inclusive classrooms: Learning to become a community. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 12*, 6-11.

Semmel, M. I., Abernathy, T. V., Butera, G., & Lesar, S. (1991, September). Teacher perceptions of the regular education initiative. *Exceptional Children,* 9-24.

Tinzmann, M. (1990). The collaborative classroom: Reconnecting teachers and learners. Elmhurst, IL: North Central Regional Education Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED327931).

Viadero, D. (1991). California project links special education, regular teachers. *Educational Journal, 9*, 1-13.

Walther-Thomas, C.S. (1997). Co-teaching experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time [Electronic version]. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, *30*, 395-407.

Welch, M., Brownell, K., & Sheridan, S.M. (1999). What's the score and game plan on teaming in schools? A review of the literature on team teaching and school-based problem-solving teams. [Electronic version]. *Remedial & Special Education, 20*(1), 36-49.

Appendices

Appendix A

Collaborative Instruction Survey and Questionnaire

Appendix B

Table 1 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Frequency

Appendix C

Table 2 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Frequency with Percentages

Appendix D

Table 3 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Crosstabulation between Classroom and Resource (Special Services) Teachers

Appendix E

Table 4 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Case Processing Summary

Appendix F

Table 5 - Group Statistics for Classroom and Resource (Special Services) Teachers

Appendix G

Table 6 - Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

Appendix H

Table 7 - t-tests of Equality of Means

Collaborative Instruction Survey

Indicate your level of agreement with the items listed below by placing a check in the appropriate column:

(1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, or (4) Strongly Disagree

In my current or most recent collaborative instructional relationship,	**(1)**	**(2)**	**(3)**	**(4)**
1. my roles and responsibilities as a collaborative team member are clearly defined.	___	___	___	___
2. I have adequate planning time with my collaborative team partner.	___	___	___	___
3. I have satisfactory access and support from my collaborative instructional partner.	___	___	___	___
4. collaborative instruction is disruptive to the regular classroom routines.	___	___	___	___
5. an open line of communication exists between my collaborative team member and myself.	___	___	___	___
6. both instructors in my collaborative team are equally accountable for the success of the students.	___	___	___	___
7. my collaborative team partner is often absent.	___	___	___	___
8. my collaborative team partner is often tardy.	___	___	___	___
9. classroom responsibilities are equitable between my collaborative team partner and myself.	___	___	___	___
10. I have received adequate training in collaborative instructional techniques, roles, and responsibilities.	___	___	___	___
11. administration is supportive of the collaborative instructional model.	___	___	___	___
12. administration develops effective scheduling for implementing collaborative instruction.	___	___	___	___
13. administration is considerate of the needs of the students and teachers when placing students for collaborative instruction.	___	___	___	___
14. my collaborative team partner and I have developed adequate skills for resolving differences in philosophy regarding students, behavior management, acceptable instructional modifications, etc.	___	___	___	___

In your opinion, what are three characteristics of an ideal collaborative partnership?

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____

Other:

_____
_____
_____

In your opinion, what are three barriers to effective collaborative partnerships?

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____

Other:

_____
_____
_____

Think back to collaborative relationships that have "worked" for you. What specific things did the collaborators do that made it work?

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____

Other:

_____
_____
_____

Recall *ineffective* collaborative experiences. In your opinion, what are three conditions that made the experience(s) ineffective? Why didn't they work?

1. _____
   _____
   _____
2. _____
   _____
   _____
3. _____
   _____
   _____

Other:

_____
_____
_____

Please fill in the information below:

Years of Full-time Teaching Experience: _____

Grade(s) Currently Teaching: _____

Years of Collaborative Instructional Experience: _____

Check one: General Education Classroom Teacher _____

Special Education Teacher _____

Early Intervention Program (EIP) Teacher _____

Highest Degree Attained: Bachelor's _____

Master's _____

Education Specialist _____

Gender: Male _____

Female _____

Table 1 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Frequency

(1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Disagree, or (4) Strongly Disagree

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
In my current or most recent collaborative instructional relationship,				
1. my roles and responsibilities as a collaborative team member are clearly defined.	_2_	_7_	_6_	_3_
2. I have adequate planning time with my collaborative team partner.	_0_	_2_	_9_	_7_
3. I have satisfactory access and support from my collaborative instructional partner.	_3_	_14	_0_	_1_
4. collaborative instruction is disruptive to the regular classroom routines.	_4_	_11	_2_	_1_
5. an open line of communication exists between my collaborative team member and myself.	_9_	_9_	_0_	_0_
6. both instructors in my collaborative team are equally accountable for the success of the students.	_2_	_7_	_7_	_2_
7. my collaborative team partner is often absent.	_4_	_6_	_6_	_2_
8. my collaborative team partner is often tardy.	_4_	_5_	_5_	_4_
9. classroom responsibilities are equitable between my collaborative team partner and myself.	_1_	_5_	_10	_2_
10. I have received adequate training in collaborative instructional techniques, roles, and responsibilities.	_3_	_7_	_8_	_0_
11. administration is supportive of the collaborative instructional model.	_9_	_7_	_2_	_0_
12. administration develops effective scheduling for implementing collaborative instruction.	_3_	_8_	_6_	_1_
13. administration is considerate of the needs of the students and teachers when placing students for collaborative instruction.	_5_	_8_	_5_	_0_
14. my collaborative team partner and I have developed adequate skills for resolving differences in philosophy regarding students, behavior management, acceptable instructional modifications, etc.	_3_	_13	_2_	_0_

Table 2 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Frequency with Percentages

Q1

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	3	16.7	16.7	16.7
	Disagree	6	33.3	33.3	50.0
	Agree	7	38.9	38.9	88.9
	Strongly Agree	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q2

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	7	38.9	38.9	38.9
	Disagree	9	50.0	50.0	88.9
	Agree	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q3

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Agree	14	77.8	77.8	83.3
	Strongly Agree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q4

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Disagree	2	11.1	11.1	16.7
	Agree	11	61.1	61.1	77.8
	Strongly Agree	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q5

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Agree	9	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Strongly Agree	9	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q6

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Disagree	7	38.9	38.9	50.0
	Agree	7	38.9	38.9	88.9
	Strongly Agree	2	11.1	11.1	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q7

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Disagree	6	33.3	33.3	44.4
	Agree	6	33.3	33.3	77.8
	Strongly Agree	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q8

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	4	22.2	22.2	22.2
	Disagree	5	27.8	27.8	50.0
	Agree	5	27.8	27.8	77.8
	Strongly Agree	4	22.2	22.2	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q9

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Disagree	10	55.6	55.6	66.7
	Agree	5	27.8	27.8	94.4
	Strongly Agree	1	5.6	5.6	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q10

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	8	44.4	44.4	44.4
	Agree	7	38.9	38.9	83.3
	Strongly Agree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q11

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Agree	7	38.9	38.9	50.0
	Strongly Agree	9	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q12

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Strongly Diasgree	1	5.6	5.6	5.6
	Disagree	6	33.3	33.3	38.9
	Agree	8	44.4	44.4	83.3
	Strongly Agree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q13

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	5	27.8	27.8	27.8
	Agree	8	44.4	44.4	72.2
	Strongly Agree	5	27.8	27.8	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Q14

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Disagree	2	11.1	11.1	11.1
	Agree	13	72.2	72.2	83.3
	Strongly Agree	3	16.7	16.7	100.0
	Total	18	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Crosstabulation between Classroom and Resource (Special Services) Teachers

TEACHER * Q1 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q1				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom		4	6	2	12
	Resource	3	2	1		6
Total		3	6	7	2	18

TEACHER * Q2 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q2			
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	6	5	1	12
	Resource	1	4	1	6
Total		7	9	2	18

TEACHER * Q3 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q3			
		Strongly Diasgree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	1	11		12
	Resource		3	3	6
Total		1	14	3	18

TEACHER * Q4 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q4				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom		2	8	2	12
	Resource	1		3	2	6
Total		1	2	11	4	18

TEACHER * Q5 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q5		
		Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	7	5	12
	Resource	2	4	6
Total		9	9	18

TEACHER * Q6 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q6				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	2	5	5		12
	Resource		2	2	2	6
Total		2	7	7	2	18

TEACHER * Q7 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q7				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	2	6	4		12
	Resource			2	4	6
Total		2	6	6	4	18

TEACHER * Q8 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q8				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	4	5	3		12
	Resource			2	4	6
Total		4	5	5	4	18

TEACHER * Q9 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q9				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	2	9	1		12
	Resource		1	4	1	6
Total		2	10	5	1	18

TEACHER * Q10 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q10			
		Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	7	3	2	12
	Resource	1	4	1	6
Total		8	7	3	18

TEACHER * Q11 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q11			
		Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	2	5	5	12
	Resource		2	4	6
Total		2	7	9	18

TEACHER * Q12 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q12				
		Strongly Diasgree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	1	6	5		12
	Resource			3	3	6
Total		1	6	8	3	18

TEACHER * Q13 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q13			
		Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	5	6	1	12
	Resource		2	4	6
Total		5	8	5	18

TEACHER * Q14 Crosstabulation

Count

		Q14			
		Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree	Total
TEACHER	Classroom	2	9	1	12
	Resource		4	2	6
Total		2	13	3	18

Table 4 – Collaborative Instruction Survey Response Case Processing Summary

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TEACHER * Q1	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q2	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q3	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q4	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q5	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q6	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q7	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q8	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q9	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q10	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q11	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q12	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q13	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%
TEACHER * Q14	18	100.0%	0	.0%	18	100.0%

Table 5 – Group Statistics for Classroom and Resource (Special Services) Teachers

Group Statistics

	TEACHER	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
TOTAL	Classroom	12	35.6667	3.5760	1.0323
	Resource	6	44.3333	3.2042	1.3081

Table 6 – Levene's Test for Equality of Variances

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	
		F	Sig.
TOTAL	Equal variances assumed	.003	.955
	Equal variances not assumed		

Table 7 – t-tests of Equality of Means

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means			
		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
TOTAL	Equal variances assumed	-5.004	16	.000	-8.6667
	Equal variances not assumed	-5.201	11.194	.000	-8.6667

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
			Lower	Upper
TOTAL	Equal variances assumed	1.7321	-12.3385	-4.9949
	Equal variances not assumed	1.6664	-12.3266	-5.0068